



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,189	09/10/2003	Brian A. Hamman	QNX001	6325

7590

09/21/2005

PATENT DOMINION
555 REPUBLIC DRIVE
SUITE 200
PLANO, TX 75074

EXAMINER

VORTMAN, ANATOLY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2835

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/666,189		HAMMAN, BRIAN A.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Anatoly Vortman		2835	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Primary Examiner: Anatoly Vortman / AU 2835. (3) Brian Hamman (applicant).
 (2) Arthur W. Fisher, Reg. No. 27,549 (representative). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 September 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: components of the cooling system have been presented.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: US/5,731,954 to Cheon & US/6,809,928 to Gwin et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

AWF

ANATOLY VORTMAN
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

[Signature]

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Applicants have presented arguments regarding the Cheon ('954) reference. Specifically, the Applicants contended that Cheon ('954) structure contains a reservoir. The Examiner stated that any component of the present invention capable of collecting cooling liquid would constitute a reservoir, while system is not operating. Also, negative limitations (i.e. absence of the reservoir) have been discussed. The Examiner has stated that addition of the negative limitations to the claims creates 35 USC 112, first paragraph problems, since the feature has not been discussed in the specification and therefore does not have a basis in the original disclosure (see MPEP 2173.05 (i)).

Further, the Applicants have presented the arguments that there is no liquid communication between the Cheon's dissipater and what the Examiner claims "an output cavity". The Applicants also maintain that Cheon does not contain a cavity. The Examiner position was that bottom portion of the heat exchanger of Cheon constitutes an output cavity. With the respect to the definition of the "self-contained heat exchanger" the Applicants presented the arguments that indefiniteness of the terminology has been addressed by the amendments to the claims, the Applicants also claim that there is a support in the specification for the "self-contained heat exchanger". The Applicants claim that the limitations "within the electronic system" distinguishes the claims over Cheon, which they believe shows at least partially exposed heat exchanger.

Regarding the "propylene glycol based coolant" claims the Examiner has presented a new reference (US/6,809,928 to Gwin et al.), which clearly anticipates the claims.

Regarding the "convective cooling" the Applicants presented arguments that in the Cheon specification, it is clear that all heat transfer units are mounted on the horizontal plane, and therefore it impossible to have advantage of the convective circulation. The Examiner responded that convective circulation may inherently take place in the Cheon device, however additional consideration will be given.

Regarding convective circulation through the Applicant's heat exchanger, the Applicants claim that their disposition of the input cavity above the output cavity as so claimed distinguished it over Cheon, wherein the Examiner has claimed that the down stream and upstream portions of the heat exchanger constitute the input cavity and the output cavity, respectively.

In conclusion the Examiner has stated that further search and consideration are necessary.



ANATOLY VORTMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER